

20 September 2017

Via CM/ECF

Hon. Raymond J. Dearie  
United States District Court  
225 Cadman Plaza East  
Brooklyn, New York 11201

**Re:     *Law Offices of N.M. Gehi, P.C. v. Consumer Opinion, LLC, et al.***  
**Case No. 1:17-cv-05468-RJD-VMS**

Dear Judge Dearie:

Pursuant to Your Honor's Individual Motion Practices, sec. III(D)(1), Defendant Consumer Opinion, LLC, understands that no motion papers are to be filed until a motion is fully briefed. That section, however, does not appear to address motion practice relative to motions filed in state court, pending at the time of removal. Although under sec. III (A), a pre-motion letter serves as a timely response under Rule 12, it does not address other deadlines. Moreover, although the opposition was timely under the Centralized Motion Part Rules of the Queens Supreme Court, the deadline to respond under Local Civ. R. 6.1 was unclear.

Thus, to avoid prejudice, Defendant filed its opposition to Plaintiff's request for preliminary injunction and temporary restraining order as Your Honor's Individual Practices were not in effect at the time Plaintiff filed its motion in state court.

Upon inquiry to Your Honor's chambers, to ensure our understanding of how Your Honor's Individual Motion Practices will comport with the pending Plaintiff's motion, we were advised that the Plaintiff's motion will be deemed active.

To best comply with Section III(D)(1) & (2), we hereby give notice that we served the opposition upon Plaintiff and filed the following documents in the motion package:

- (1) Dkt. No. 1-4: Request for Judicial Intervention, Proposed Order to Show Cause for Injunction with Temporary Restraining Order, Legal Memo in Support of Order to Show Cause for Preliminary Injunction and Temporary Restraining Order (and exhibits thereto);
- (2) Dkt. No. 4: Defendant's Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Request for Judicial Intervention Seeking Order to Show Cause for Preliminary Injunction and Temporary Restraining Order and exhibit thereto;
- (3) Dkt. No. 5: Declaration of Michael Podolsky and exhibit thereto.

...

...

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "J. Wolman", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jay Marshall Wolman

cc: Safashia Khan-Semiz, Esq.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X  
LAW OFFICES OF N.M. GEHI, P.C.,

Plaintiff,

- against -

CONSUMER OPINION, LLC, *et al.*,

Defendants.  
-----X

Case No.: 1:17-cv-05468-RJD-VMS

**CERTIFICATE**  
**OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on September 20, 2017, I electronically filed the enclosed letter dated September 19, 2017 addressed to the Hon. Raymond J. Dearie from Jay M. Wolman with the Clerk of the Court using CM/ECF. I further certify that a true and correct copy of the aforementioned document is being served via electronic mail and U.S. Mail to the attorneys listed below:

Safashia Khan-Semiz, Esq.  
LAW OFFICES OF N.M. GEHI, P.C.  
118-21 Queens Blvd, Suite 409  
Forest Hills, New York 11375  
<safashia@gehilaw.com>

*Attorneys for Plaintiff,*  
*LAW OFFICES OF N.M. GEHI, P.C.*

Respectfully submitted,



Trey A. Rothell,  
Employee of Randazza Legal Group, PLLC